DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 398 JC 740 211

AUTHOR Clements, Clyde C., Jr.
TITLE How Staff Development Works in the Small Community College.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 15p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Teachers; *Community Colleges; Consultants; *Instructional Improvement; Post Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Speeches; *Staff Improvement; *State Programs; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Lake City Community College

ABSTRACT

The staff-development process in a small community college that has no full-time Educational Development Officer is described. The process is discussed in relation to faculty improvement meetings, professional improvement meetings, staff and program development fund, federally funded projects, vocational/technical grants, departmental and individual faculty/staff projects, and grant applications for 1974-75. The schoolwide objectives for the faculty/staff/program improvement are provided. The methods of meeting the objectives are discussed in relation to faculty mini-workshops. The improvement program is described in the three areas of: methods of improving instruction, critical issues, and the use of nationally known consultants. The Florida system of staff and program development funds and coordination of the statewide program are sketched. Twelve faculty development meetings held during 1973-74 are listed. (DB)

ED 095398

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

How Staff Development Works in The Small Community College

By Dr. Clyde C. Clements, Jr.
Director of Program Development
Lake City Community College
Lake City, Florida

I want to describe working on staff development in the small, innovative community college which cannot afford a full-time Educational Development Officer. Lake City Community College is a small college of 2000 students located in rural North Central Florida with an instructional staff of under 100. Yet our college has a long standing commitment to innovation. And the diverse background of the faculty needed to staff the comprehensive curriculum makes staff development paramount. On the technical side our faculty frequently needs assistance on how to teach their skill. In both the transfer and technical divisions the faculty needs added exposure to the concept of the open door, the comprehensive curriculum, community services, and the understanding of the background of the community college student. Instructional strategies to accommodate diverse students including the use of performance objectives, and packaging, computer-assisted instruction and media support have been staff development priorities this year.

I am Director of Program Development. Let me describe the functions of the office:

> The Office of Program Development provides a systems approach to academic improvement that involves faculty committees in cooperation with the President's Administrative Council to establish priorities. By this cooperation

JC 740 211

> all aspects of academic improvement focus on meeting college objectives with an emphasis on meaningful innovation.
> The Director of Program Development serves as the professional staff advisor on program development for the college, keeping the president, vice president, and administrative council advised of trends in extra-budgetary support that might affect policy or long-range plans. The Development Officer also assists in staff development plans of the college to improve teaching and insure a learner-oriented program. (Administrative Handbook, Lake City Community College.)

I have spent 30-40 percent of my time on staff development plans in the academic year of 1973-74.

Our Academic Improvement Program was submitted and accepted as an Exemplary Practice for Staff and Program Development by the State Department of Education. Lake City Community College had a year long commitment to staff development in the following areas:

1. A major focus was our faculty development series, a monthly mini-workshop in how to improve instruction and critical issues for the community college educators. 2. Our staff and program development fund monies from the State, which are controlled by a staff committee, serve as direct initiative by the faculty into the staff development process. 3. Our committee approach to the grants idea, including writing up of a proposal request calls for thinking through issues and focussing more clearly on objectives for curriculum and instructional improvement by the faculty. 4. Special programs such as the work of the Compensatory Education Task Force, called for growth on the part of committee members, research, reading, site-visits, and awareness of new concepts. Out of this came a revision of non-credit progressive studies into a modularized, full-transfer credit program with a human relations component.

In reviewing these four areas--faculty development series, staff and program development fund, the committee approach to grants, and the special task force on compensatory education, the first two are clearly within a narrow definition of staff development. I would contend, too, that faculty growth stimulated by our committee approach to grants, and our special faculty task force on compensatory education also contributed to inservice education.

This position would also be consistent with the interconnected policy funding of staff and program development by the State of Florida.

The total Academic Improvement Program may be viewed in this way:

PART I Objectives

PART II Faculty Improvement Meetings

PART III Professional Improvement Meetings

PART IV Staff and Program Development Fund

PART V Federally Funded Projects

PART VI Vocational - Technical (SDE) Grants

PART VII Departmental and Individual Faculty/Staff Projects

PART VIII Grant Applications for 1974-75

Our schoolwide Objectives for the Faculty/Staff/Program Improvement for 1973-74 are set down:

A. To provide all faculty with an orientation to CAI (computer-assisted instruction).

B. To provide all faculty with an orientation to individualizing instruction and writing performance objectives for at least one course (1973-74).

1) Techincal Division

(a) To update syllabi and lesson plans by each instructor for one block/phase of his instruction.

(b) To provide in-service education for faculty in "How to Teach."

(c) Write performance objectives for at least one course during the year.

2) Transfer Division

(a) Follow a system for improving the learning experience, e.g., "CLMS."

(b) Update syllabi; write one sample lesson plan for one course.

(c) Write performance objectives for at least one course during the year.

(d) Review and evaluate all pre-college, progressive studies courses--make plans for necessary changes. Prepare Compensatory Education Task Force Recommendation.

(e) Involve all faculty in revision of general education requirements.

(f) Initiate division-wide honors program.

(g) Investigate CAI potential use in Transfer courses.

C. To implement the college long-range plan for CLMS, a Creative Learning Management System, 1974-1980.

1. CLMS Committee Workshop 1/29/74

2. CLMS Sub-Committees (Units 1-7), complete "PERT" for pilot model by March 30, 1974.

3. Program pilot model in computer beginning in September, 1974.

D. To continue faculty/staff in-service education to meet the changing educational requirements of the college based on annual needs assessment.

To meet these objectives our faculty development series of mini-workshops served as a principal vehicle. The year-long

program was in three areas: (1) methods of improving instruction through CAI, media support, and writing performance objectives; (2) critical issues like the four-day week, competency-based education, and non-punitive grading, featuring factual presentations, panels, and open discussion of each issue; (3) natioanlly known consultants like Dr. John Roueche and Dr. James Wattenbarger to discuss the community college goals and philosophy and work with the faculty.

Methods to Improve Instruction

The fall semester of the Faculty Development Series focussed on ways to improve instruction. In order to help the faculty become aware of new Learning Resources services and equipment the Media specialist, Tom McCracken, conducted a workshop with hands-on applications. The Director of the National Science Foundation funded training consortium for computer-assisted instruction, Robert Moore, explained how teams of circuit riders could help faculty to use CAI by visiting the campus once a week. Moore conducted a session in August nad again in December to make the faculty fully aware of the on-going chance to learn to use computer-assisted instruction. Faculty were trained to use both the leased terminal to the University of Florida and the new Lake City Community College mini-computer system installed by Director of Computing Activities, John Griffith.

In another area several consultants, Dr. Howard Kirk and Dr. Ron Peake, University of West Florida, assisted the Technical Division to meet the state mandate of specifying program objectives. Dean Walter Parnell and I provided informa-

tion and directions to Transfer faculty undertaking a similar task.

Critical Issues in Education

Burning issues proved to be a successful format. Research was done on a topical area important to the staff perception and acceptance such as competency-based instruction. This research was presented in a factual way to the faculty, either by a single speaker or a panel. Open discussion then took place. I well remember my presentation on competency-based instruction and the debate provoked by Benjamin Blooms' statement that up to ninety percent of students could achieve mastery if the time factor were flexible and instruction were fully individualized. Arthur Cohen's sample objectives took quite a scouring from the liberal arts faculty at that early October meeting. Yet by the Spring, faculty had met their deadline on program objectives and were coming to the office for individual help on course objectives and packaging.

Another burning issue was presented by President Phillips in the form of a proposal to put the school on the Four Day Week in response to the energy crisis. This issue was examined in faculty forum and by the students before it was adopted. A comprehensive assessment of the Four Day Week was done by staff psychologist, Clark Hardman, for the State Department of Education.

Perhaps, the most controversial issue of all was the proposed revision of the progressive studies program at Lake City Community College. After a four-month study by the Compensatory Education Task Force, which included visits to successful programs, and receiving advice from experts like

Dr. John Roueche, University of Texas, the proposal was sent before the Curriculum Committee and Steering and Planning Committee where it was endorsed. Faculty opinion had been sampled in a November meeting chaired by Dean Parnell. Then the Task Force was formed with me as Chairman, and a final presentation was made in March by the Task Force. Dr. John Roueche conducted a wrap up workshop in April on the implications of open admissions and presented examples of successful compensatory programs around the country.

The result was that six of the seven recommendations passed full faculty consent. In the Fall Lake City Community College will have an individualized full credit system of compensatory studies allowing the student to start at his own level in math, English, or reading, and progress at his own pace to completion of the performance objectives. Human Relations and improved counseling will provide the "glue"--the study skills, improvement in self-concept, and career and program counseling so necessary to help former underachievers.

Use of Consultants

In our series aimed at improving instruction in the fall, faculty reaction led me to believe that the presentation and discussion of community college concepts would be essential to the success of our program. Comments from the transfer faculty indicated that some still held reference points to a four-year liberal arts program and to graduate school standards rather than the general education requirements of the community college. And a number of the technical faculty indicated that they too, needed help in accepting the concept of the open door, the com-

prehensive curriculum, community services, and the nature and background of the community college student. These points were the concepts called for by the EPDA Advisory Committee in their report, People for the People's Colleges. Wider dissemination of these concepts among community college staff was stressed.

We were fortunate to have close to us, Dr. James Wattenbarger of the University of Florida, the idea man of Florida community college movement. Dr. Wattenbarger's dissertation study metamorphosed over a period of a few years into the master plan for the Florida community college systems. Dr. Wattenbarger kicked off the spring series with a discussion of the goals and philosophy of the Florida community college movement. He traced the change from several small junior colleges to the system of twenty-eight colleges with an articulation agreement providing junior level transfer to the senior universities. He emphasized the aims and objectives of the system in its service to the citizenry of the state. The Chairman of our History Department told me that this was the best presentation ever brought to our campus.

Dr. Wattenbarger was on campus a full day as was Dr. John Roueche in his work with the faculty on individualization and compensatory education. Coffee, and an informal session is set up in the morning for those who can attend, followed by the mini-workshop sessions. Dr. Mary McCaulley, University of Florida, whose topic was the use of Myers-Briggs Personality Inventory in Education, and Dr. H. H. McAshan, University of North

Florida, whose topic was Behavioral Objectives for the Psycho-Motor and Affective Areas and the Systems Approach, also had sessions and mini-workshops in the same format during the spring. I recommend this full day use of on-campus consultants for promoting faculty change.

The full schedule of faculty development workshops is attached.

In order to understand the Florida State system of staff and program development funds, let me briefly sketch the background as set forth in the publication, Staff and Program Development in Florida's Community Colleges 1972-73, published by the Department of Education, Tallahassee.

Up to July 1, 1973, authority for Staff and Program Development was S 230.767 Florida Statutes. The State Board of Education regulations and directives from the Division of Community Colleges provided administrative assistance. Funding then was at a rate of three percent of salaries.

Under new funding procedures, Staff and Program Development authorization is removed from law. State Board of Education Regulations (6A-8.761) now provide the authority for the SPD program and provide the allocation formula. Further direction for administration rests with the Division of Community Colleges. The program is funded at the rate of two percent of the previous year's apportionment for current operation. The two percent is an add-on to the portion appropriated to a school from the money earned by FTE formula. So SPD money is clearly

not intended for normal costs but for "training and start-up money," according to President Herbert Phillips of Lake City Community College who has watched its operation since the beginning.

The framers of the SPD program in Florida wisely saw staff and program development as interconnected. For programs, the emphasis was clearly on initiating and planning new programs, not expanding old ones. For staff, the improvement in competencies might include "interacting and updating experiences in human relations, in occupational skills, in subject matter, in teaching techniques, in foundation disciplines, and in resources utilization." "Staff" was defined to include all personnel employed by the colleges.

Each college had to submit a broad Five Year Goals Plan for staff and program development, which was to be updated annually. Also, each college must submit an Activity Plan with a budget summary and an Activity Evaluation for each discrete activity.

The thrust of SPD was to be on innovation and improvement. Funding new positions with SPD money is limited to a maximum of three years. Purchasing new equipment was similarly restricted to program initiation and improvement with a limit of fifteen percent for hardware. Preparation for accreditation self-study was also prohibited.

Yet within these restrictions the number and variety of activities supported is amazing--faculty have been helped to attend off-campus seminars and professional meetings, to continue professional study, or to develop a new curriculum approach or

to mediate a course.

Some SPD activities have been pointed towards reaching potential students or keeping the ones we have in school. Brevard Community College supported a Mobile Recruiting Unit. Lake City Community College set up a Career Information Center. A school wide tutorial program and student advising program using peers has also aided our retention at Lake City. Students have helped to implement and test the dividing of basic science courses into modules. Start-up costs for our instructional mini-computer system were partially defrayed by SPD money. This included paying the technician to devise and keep the system in operation and certain basic equipment. President Phillips commented, "Computer-Assisted Instruction is a new teaching tool at Lake City Community College and it would have been impossible to start without SPD monies."

Coordination of the statewide program is through a system of SPD coordinators with one from each community college. In the majority of cases, the SPD money is administered from the President's office, Dean's office, or Development office. Some other colleges use faculty evaluation panels. In a recent coordinators' conference our faculty chairman found out that Lake City Community College was the only college to have both faculty evaluation and faculty responsibility for the administration and financial bookkeeping. Mrs. Burnette serves without pay as our Chairman of Steering and Planning Committee, composed of elected faculty. A major responsibility of this committee on committees is SPD fund administration. The Development Officer also serves on the committee to provide advice as to how the SPD program relates to the entire grants posture of the college.

Any faculty member may make a proposal to the committee for support by filling out an Activity Plan. Each desired activity must have two readings before the faculty committee. Generally, this proponent makes a brief presentation or is available to answer questions as to the goals, objectives, and procedures, evaluation, and budget for the activity. The proposed Activity should mesh with the Five Year Plan and yearly goals of the college. By keeping a close eye on the budget our coordinator is able to give the committee guidance on the number of projects which can be approved.

Our Steering and Planning Committee itself administers "Project Lift," an SPD activity for faculty. Travel to professional meetings, or to view a successful program at another school to get ideas, or even to pay one-half tuition for a professional course is provided for a faculty member who can justify his request.

The last area of staff development I wish to sketch quickly is our committee method of generating ideas and helping to execute a federal or state proposal. I have found that in grants involving a substantial institutional commitment, it is best to form a committee from all affected areas of the college. A chairman is elected who may eventually become the project officer. Three planning meetings with a time schedule are then set up. At the first planning meeting, the Development Officer explains the guidelines. A consultant in the subject matter of the grant may make a presentation to provide expertise. Assignment will then be given out to committee members for:

a. the problem and specific facts from subject areas

b. goals and objectives

c. implementing procedures

d. evaluation

e. budget materials

Each committee member then presents at the second meeting his position paper covering points a - e. This meeting is a working session to spot discrepancies in program, purposes, and budget. Considerable faculty growth is encouraged in this interchange of ideas from various disciplines.

At the third meeting the Development Officer presents an edited version of the committee papers approximating the guidelines of the proposal. This full committee provides the final feedback. From there the proposal goes to the President for institutional approval.

I have found this committee method clears up a great many misunderstandings, encourages staff growth in preparing position papers, and helps to select a project officer. It is a viable institutional method for proposal development which provides staff growth at the same time.

Faculty Development Meetings 1973-74

1. May 30, 1974
   Faculty All, "Behavior Objectives for Psycho-Motor and Affective Areas and the Systems Approach." Dr. H. H. McAshan, University of North Florida.

2. April 18, 1974
   Faculty All, "Individualization of Education and the Implications of Open Admissions," Dr. John Roueche, Prof. of Educational Administration, and Director, Jr. College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin.

3. March 11, 1974
   Faculty All, "Non-Punitive Grading Systems" Dr. Clyde Clements, and panel discussion with Dean Parnell, Dean Attaway and Compensatory Education Task Force.

4. February 11, 1974
   CLMS Committee Progress Report to the Faculty, Tom Rowand, Chairman; Unit 1, MBTI, Ch. Graham Anthony; Unit 2, Career Guidance-Admissions, Ch. Martha Brown; Unit 3, Testing, Ch. Clark Hardman; Unit 4, Learning Prescription, Ch. Dean Parnell; Unit 5, Master Records, Ch. President Phillips; Unit 6, Individualized CAI modules of instruction, faculty; Bill Alexander, Dean Attaway, Dr. Clyde Clements, Dale Drew, John Griffith, Paul Gunning, Robert McDonald, Dean Parnell, Jeanne Rehberg, Dave Richards, Tom Rowand, Wiley Russell, Frank Sedmera.

5. January 29, 1974
   CLMS Committee Workshop (Open to Faculty) Learning Prescriptions (Matching Teaching Styles-Learning Styles) and Career Guidance Matching "behavioral characteristics" to career requirements - Dr. Mary McCaulley, Division of Allied Health, Department of Clinical Psychology, Typology Laboratory, University of Florida.

6. January 15, 1974
   Faculty All "Goals and Philosophy of the Florida Community College Movement" Dr. James Wattenbarger, Professor of Higher Education, University of Florida, and director of the Institute of Higher Education.

7. December 10, 1973
   "FRCCA - An Innovative Approach to Regional Educational Services: The NSF Computer Assisted Instruction Training Consortium." Mr. Robert Moore, Project Director.

8. November 12, 1973
   "What's New in the Transfer Division" Dean Parnell and Faculty.

9. October 29, 1973
"Media Overview," Tom McCracken

10. October 8, 1973
"Performance Objectives," Dr. Clyde Clements

11. August 18, 1973
"Orientation to CAI Programs Available to Faculty/Staff via Instructional Mini Computer System and FRCCA Network, (University of Florida Terminal)."

12. August 3, 1973
"Management by Objectives Program and Demonstration of 2 Self-Paced Instructional Packages." Dr. Wayne Scott.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 26 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION